

**CITY OF SEATTLE  
SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

**A. BACKGROUND**

**1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:**

Parking code amendments proposal (Reg Reform Ordinance #2)

**2. Name of applicant:**

City of Seattle, Dept. of Planning and Development

**3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:**

Applicant's Contact: Gordon Clowers, Planning and Developmt. Specialist II  
(206) 684-8375

Department of Planning and Development  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 2000  
PO Box 34019  
Seattle, Washington 98124-4019

**4. Date checklist prepared:**

July 7, 2011

**5. Agency requesting checklist:**

City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development

**6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):**

Approval by Seattle City Council and Mayor in 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2011

**7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.**

No.

**8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.**

None, except for the SEPA determination associated with this proposal.

**9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.**

This non-project proposal affects a wide variety of properties throughout the city, and some pending decisions on affected properties are possible but have no known bearing on this proposal.

- 10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.**

Mayor and Seattle City Council approval

- 11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the site of the project. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)**

The Department of Planning and Development is proposing to amend the Land Use Code (Title 23) as follows:

- Enable the market to determine parking for residential and non-residential uses in all areas within ¼-mile of frequent transit service, by setting no minimum parking requirement; and
- Within Urban Centers and Station Area overlays, apply the same “no minimum parking” requirement to future development on Major Institution properties, thereby improving flexibility and reducing costs and possible barriers to new institutional development.

- 12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.**

The proposal includes changes that would affect multifamily residential and non-residential zones (including industrial zones and commercial zones) within the city, located in designated Urban Centers and Station Area Overlay Districts near light rail stations, and also other areas that would include Urban Villages and other areas that are within walking distance of frequent transit service.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

**1. Earth**

**a. General description of the site (circle one):**

***Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other:***

Seattle's topography encompasses a full range of flat and hilly areas.

**b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?**

Hilly edges throughout the city range above 40% in a number of locations.

**c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.**

A wide variety of soil types and classifications are present throughout the city, including glacial tills, sands, clays, gravels and varied mixes of these soil types.

**d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.**

Unstable soils throughout the city are predominantly mapped by the city's critical area maps.

**e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.**

None is proposed in relation to the recommended non-project actions.

**f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.**

No. The proposal is non-project in nature. See section D of this checklist for additional commentary. Individual projects that may utilize the provisions of this proposal will be subject to additional environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

**g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?**

The affected area is not a single development site, and the proposal is non-project in nature.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:**

None are proposed.

## **2. Air**

- a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.**

None for this non-project proposal; see section D.1 of this checklist for more commentary.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.**

No.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:**

None proposed.

## **3. Water**

### **a. Surface:**

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.**

There are numerous water bodies in and around the city. There is not a single site for this non-project proposal.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.**

No.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

None identified for this non-project proposal. See Section D of this checklist for additional commentary.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

No.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

No.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

No. See Section D of this checklist for additional commentary.

**b. Ground:**

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

No. This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist for any discussion of groundwater relationships.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals ...; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

**c. Water Runoff (including storm water):**

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project proposal.

- 2) **Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.**

No. This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

- d. **Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, or runoff water impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

#### 4. Plants

- a. **Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:**

☒ -X\_ - deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other  
☒ -X\_ - evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other  
☒ -X\_ - shrubs  
☒ -X\_ - grass  
\_\_\_\_ - pasture  
\_\_\_\_ - crop or grain  
\_\_\_\_ - wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk-cabbage, other  
\_\_\_\_ - water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other  
\_\_\_\_ - other types of vegetation

- b. **What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?**

None. This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

- c. **List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.**

This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

- d. **Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:**

None.

#### 5. Animals

- a. **Circle any birds and animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:**

This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

**birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:**

☒ -X\_ Typical songbirds, hawks, etc. present in Seattle possibly

including eagles.

**mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other: squirrels**

\_X\_ Typical range of mammals as present in Seattle and its stream vicinities.

**fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:**  
None.

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.**

This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

- c. Is the site part of a migration route?**

This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:**

None proposed

## **6. Energy and Natural Resources**

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.**

A full range of available energy types could be used with future development that might be affected by this non-project proposal.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.**

No.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal?**

None. This is a non-project proposal.

**List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

## **7. Environmental Health**

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.**

None identified for this non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

**1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

None identified.

**2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:**

None identified.

**b. Noise**

**1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment operation, other)?**

This is a non-project proposal; thus area noise would not affect a particular project site. Noise exposure varies in different parts of the city, from traffic and typical commercial activity noises in commercial areas, to industrial noises, to less-intensive noise environments in many residential environments across the city.

**2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from site.**

This is a non-project proposal. Elements of the proposal addressing accommodation of ground-floor and outdoor commercial uses, accessory dwelling units and home occupations, could generate added noise in different parts of the city, over the long-term. See section D of the checklist for other commentary. Individual uses or developments that may utilize the provisions of this proposal will be subject to additional environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

**3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**8. Land and Shoreline Use**

**a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?**

The proposal relates to most zones across the city, encompassing a full range of land uses. See section D of this checklist.



**b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.**

This is a non-project proposal relating to most zones across the city. Some agricultural use was present in the city in the distant past.

**c. Describe any structures on the site.**

This non-project proposal relates to most zones across the city, encompassing the full range of structure types within the city. See section D of this checklist.

**d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?**

No. This is a non-project proposal.

**e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?**

This non-project proposal relates to most zones across the city. See section D of this checklist.

**f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?**

This non-project proposal relates to most zones across the city. See section D of this checklist. All of the affected area is designated Urban.

**g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?**

This non-project proposal relates to most zones across the city and could have a relationship to future development on shoreline-proximate land, but is not intended to affect shoreline master program designations or rules.

**h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area?**

This non-project proposal relates to most zones across the city. See section D of this checklist for additional commentary.

**i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?**

This non-project proposal relates to most zones across the city, rather than a particular project site. See section D of this checklist

**j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?**

None identified. This non-project proposal relates to most zones

across the city, rather than a particular project site. See section D of this checklist.

**k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and project land uses and plans, if any:**

None proposed. See section D of this checklist.

**9. Housing**

**a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

None. This is a non-project proposal. See Section D of this checklist.

**b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

None. This is a non-project proposal.

**c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**10. Aesthetics**

**a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?**

No structures are proposed. This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

**b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?**

None known; this is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

**c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

## **11. Light and Glare**

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?**

This is a non-project proposal with no direct light/glare impacts. Future uses relevant to the rules addressed in this proposal could influence light and glare generation. See section D of this checklist.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?**

This is a non-project proposal with no direct light/glare impacts. Future uses relevant to the rules addressed in this proposal could influence light and glare generation, but would not be anticipated to generate safety hazards or view interference. See section D of this checklist.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?**

None known.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any.**

None proposed.

## **12. Recreation**

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?**

None identified. This is a non-project proposal affecting most zones in the city. See section D of this checklist

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.**

No. This is a non-project proposal.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:**

None proposed.

## **13. Historic and Cultural Preservation**

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site?**

None known, other than the citywide inventory of landmarks; this is a non-project proposal affecting properties across the city. It does not particularly address landmarks or historic/cultural sensitive sites, and existing rules regulating such sites would not be anticipated to be affected by the proposal. See section D of this checklist.

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.**

See the response to question #13a above.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any.**

None proposed.

#### **14 . Transportation**

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe the proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.**

This is a non-project proposal; the affected area is served by the entire street/highway network in the city.

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

Yes, the entire city is served by public transit. The proposal is intended to affect all areas within ¼ mile of frequent transit service.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?**

This is a non-project proposal rather than a single-site development proposal. Individual future development projects that may be affected by regulatory provisions of this proposal will be subject to additional environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review. The proposal would not eliminate existing parking spaces but could affect future rates of parking space provision in future developments across the city.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private):**

No. This is a non-project proposal. No new roads or street improvements are anticipated to be needed as a result of this proposal. See section D of this checklist.

- e. **Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

No. This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

- f. **How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.**

This is a non-project proposal. See section D of this checklist.

- g. **Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any.**

None proposed.

## **15. Public Services**

- a. **Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

This is a non-project proposal that could indirectly lead to future development that would increase the need for public services. See section D of this checklist.

- b. **Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.**

None proposed.

## **16. Utilities**

- a. **Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.**

All utilities are available, in varying degrees, across the city. This is a non-project proposal.

- b. **Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

None proposed. This is a non-project proposal.

**C. Signature**

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature:

---

Date

Submitted: \_\_\_\_\_

This checklist was reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Senior Land Use Planner, Department of Planning and Development

Any comments or changes made by the Department are entered in the body of the checklist and contain the initials of the reviewer.

---

**D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS**  
**(Do not use this sheet for project actions)**

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

**1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?**

This non-project proposal would result in no direct impacts with respect to water, air, toxic/hazardous substances or noise as it would not directly result in future development of any particular property.

Enabling the provision of less parking in future new development on Major Institutions' properties in Urban Centers and Station Areas, and for residential and non-residential uses in other areas near frequently-served transit routes would encourage and likely result in less per capita generation of earth, water and habitat disturbance by future development. This would be due in part to a reduced need to excavate and/or fill for future buildings to provide underground parking or surface parking.

The proposal would also encourage and likely result in less per capita generation of air and water pollutant emissions over the long term – for example, tailpipe emissions, hydrocarbon emissions and other vehicle-related pollutant leakage that is washed off roads and into stormwater. This would be due to a probable reduction in reliance upon automobiles for travel in and around urban neighborhoods of Seattle where transit is available, on an average per capita basis. Also, to the extent that additional and more efficient residential and mixed-use development is encouraged in Urban Centers and station areas rather than in other more outlying parts of the region, there would be a probable lesser level of air pollutants emitted per unit of growth, due to differences in commuting choices and associated vehicle travel. This means the potential benefits of concentrating future growth (in Urban Centers, station areas, or otherwise near frequently-served transit routes) would include probable regional savings in air pollutant emissions and resultant lesser potential for significant adverse air quality impacts than if growth occurred in a more dispersed fashion. Thus, the potential for significant adverse natural environmental impacts from this element of the proposal would be minimal.

**Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:**

None proposed.

**2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?**

This non-project proposal would result in no direct impacts with respect to plants, animals, fish or marine life, as it would not involve development of the affected properties. Also, the potential for impacts on these resources from net potentially increased levels of future development (directly or indirectly encouraged by the proposal) is minimal due to their limited probable presence in affected areas. Seattle has many micro-habitat areas and edges such as shorelines and greenbelts that afford the best urban plant and animal habitats, and many portions of its neighborhoods may also be suitable for urban-adapted wildlife. To the extent that the proposal might generate net positive effects on plant/animal habitat, it could help to concentrate additional growth more efficiently in urbanized areas such as Urban Centers, which could reduce or delay further potential development elsewhere in the city or in the region where there is available higher-quality habitat.

**Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:**

None proposed.

**3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?**

The non-project proposal would result in no direct impacts on these resources as it would not involve development or consumption of energy or natural resources. If the proposal indirectly leads to additional development or a faster pace of future development, it could lead to incremental additions to energy/natural resource depletion. However, this would likely be offset over the long-term by the probable concentrating effects of the proposal on future development, near areas with good transit service. This concentration and focus of regional and in-city growth patterns in Seattle would likely lead to substantive region-wide and Seattle-wide improvements in overall energy efficiency, leading to tremendous levels of avoided energy consumption for travel alone. Per capita energy consumption for construction of housing and other structures and for residency would also likely be substantively less than if housing was instead provided in more far-flung locations regionally. Such effects would be consistent with the directions and policies of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan and regional growth management planning.

**Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:**

None proposed, other than compliance with City rules and policies that would apply to future development to avoid impacts on protected natural resources.

**4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?**



The proposal would result in no direct impacts to environmentally critical areas or the other listed types of environmentally sensitive features as it would not involve development of properties with these resources. Also, the indirect potential impacts of the proposal are not likely to differentially affect any of these particular resources, of which historic/cultural resources and wetlands possibly would be the most frequent of these resources present across the city. Current City and State rules governing wetlands and historic/cultural resources would continue to apply. This means that while historic/cultural sites and wetlands or floodplains could conceivably be present on properties that are affected in some way by this proposal, the probable effects of the proposal are not likely to induce more rapid development in a manner that would harm or eliminate these resources.

**Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:**

Adherence to current City of Seattle rules and regulations that pertain to environmentally critical areas would be required of future development.

**5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?**

The proposal would result in no direct impacts to land and shoreline use as it is a non-project proposal. The proposal would aid in encouraging future development consistent with the intent of Comprehensive Plan policies and growth strategies, by encouraging denser mixed-use patterns within urban centers and station area overlay districts. The overall adverse impact implications with respect to land use are not interpreted to be significant nor are they anticipated to result in potential for significant adverse incompatibilities of land use or inconsistencies with the city's planning and policy directions.

- a. The proposal for increased flexibility to provide less minimum parking where transit service is frequent is likely to increase the diversity of uses present at ground floors of future developments. To the extent that some developments choose to provide no parking or reduced parking, a pattern of street-oriented uses could become more prevalent in more street frontages, and a pattern with less exposure of adjacent uses to parking in the rear of buildings could also occur. Also the proposal element could help lead to residential uses becoming more frequently present at ground level. These are relatively neutral or positive land use impacts, and no potential for significant adverse land use impacts is identified.
- b. A proposal for no minimum parking requirement for major institutions in urban centers and station area overlay districts would be expected to have little if any effect on area land use patterns or spillover land use impact potential. Major institutions' development capabilities are very influenced by master plan requirements; they cannot expand into adjacent properties at will. Land use effects related to differential parking provision are not seen as a probable or significant adverse impact outcome, and might in fact lead to reduced exposure of nearby uses to surface parking lots over time, due to a

possible lesser need for parking as a land use. Such institutions would likely continue to provide levels of parking to meet demands at levels their leadership would identify as needed, and could also continue to benefit from available parking surpluses if present.

**Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and use impacts are:**

None proposed.

**6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?**

The proposal would result in no direct impacts to transportation or public services or utilities because it is a non-project proposal. The proposal would aid in encouraging future development consistent with the intent of Comprehensive Plan policies and growth strategies, by helping to encourage denser mixed-use patterns within urban centers and station area overlay districts. This future development would likely contribute to higher volumes of vehicle traffic in all of these urban centers or station area overlay districts. However, it would also tend to increase average proximity of residents and businesses to locations with frequent transit service, thereby increasing the capability and probability that future residents will use transit service more frequently, on a per capita basis, to move around the city.

Over the long-term the cumulative effect of the proposal on provision of public services and utilities is likely to avoid significant adverse impacts and could even generate positive impacts through encouragement of more efficient clustering of development in areas already served by city utilities and public services. The long-term development pattern supported by the proposal would likely be more efficient than other possible density patterns that might be more dispersed. This principle also is particularly relevant when compared on a regional basis, where per-capita costs and inefficiencies of utility and public service provision for a comparable amount of residential housing likely would be significantly greater than if growth is more densely accommodated in Seattle's designated growth centers.

The various elements of the proposal would generate differing levels and types of potential transportation impacts, summarized as follows.

- a. Enabling the market to determine minimum parking provided for any area where frequent transit service is nearby would likely lead to lesser provision of parking than would otherwise have occurred, but in a manner that would likely be more efficient than in today's developments. This means that developers would more consciously select the amount of parking provided based on the interpretation of probable actual demands and/or other factors such as parking levels required by financing parties. To the extent that future resident and employee populations will probably seek more frequently to use transit and non-motorized modes of travel in the future, there is a relatively high probability of a reduced per-capita demand for parking over the long-term. This could also be affected by higher probable future prevailing costs of parking that would occur in the future, or have already occurred through

city parking policies such as paid parking meters and rates. In short, if it is more difficult and costly for people to drive to a destination, they are more likely to seek alternate means of visiting, which would moderate the potential magnitude of parking impacts. Similarly, residents in surrounding areas would be more likely to arrive by foot or bicycle, additionally contributing to less per-capita reliance upon vehicles for travel. Also, additional off-site parking resources could be provided if the market attracts private parking provision. Despite all of these factors' probable efficacy in limiting on-street parking impacts, they would not eliminate the possibility that some areas could experience spillover parking impacts with future development. These potential impacts are interpreted as adverse but not significant adverse impacts, due to the potential that the factors described above (or other similar factors) would help mitigate and reduce the potential for significant adverse parking impacts.

- b. The discussion in item "a" above is also relevant to the proposal for no minimum parking requirement for future new developments in Major Institutions properties in Urban Centers and station areas. These institutions already have on-site parking in notable quantities, may have surplus parking available, and would likely make future parking choices for new development that would satisfy their perceived parking demands. Also, these major institutions already address transportation management through required transportation management plans that help to discourage single-occupant vehicle travel by employees and visitors. The sum total of what this means for parking at major institutions would be increased flexibility to make choices that would be more efficient in the provision of parking, with a probable retention by the institution of programs that would continue to promote alternative transportation choices. These institutions' performance in the existing condition appear to be reliably measured and fully or predominantly in conformance with transportation management plan targets. It is most probable that such trends would continue into the future, especially for the major institutions that are located within Urban Centers.

**Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:**

None proposed.

**7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.**

It is believed that the proposal would not result in conflicts with local, state or federal laws or requirements for protection of the environment.